

REMARKS:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 5 and 14 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested. Claims 1-23 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIMS OBJECTIONS:

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5 and 14.

In view of the Office Action's helpful suggestions, claims 5 and 14 have been amended to clarify of the present invention.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e):

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda (US Patent No. 6,607,260 B1). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action asserts that Ikeda discloses sensing the two claimed test marks. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

By way of review, Ikeda sets forth: "outputs from the sensor 106 during the above image reading operations are shown in FIG. 4 almost in the middle thereof as <sensor output> waveforms and in FIG. 3 as output signals from the image reading portion 1. An output waveform from this sensor is shaped by the circuit 5 including the comparator, which is a component of the image interval measuring portion 3 shown in FIG. 3, and this waveform is then input to the counter 9... until the next rising edge." (col. 14, lines 56-67).

In Ikeda, in order to get the distances between a-ref1 and a-F and a-ref1 and a-R, the sensor should sense the distance not only between a-ref1 and a-F but also a-ref1 and a-R. The sensor must review at least 3 test marks, such as a-ref1, a-F and, a-R to get the distances, in accordance with Ikeda.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Ikeda at least fails to disclose "sensing the two test marks" as recited claim 1, as well as the claimed detecting of an actual error distance based on the two test marks. Ikeda requires at least more than two marks.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Ikeda does not disclose the invention recited in claim 1.

Claim 7 is deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 1, as claim 7 includes similar allowable features with differing scope and breadth.

Claims 2-6 and 8-12, which depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, are deemed

patentable due at least to their depending from claims 1 and 7.

Regarding claim 13, at pages 5-6 of the Office Action asserts that Ikeda discloses “test mark print-directing unit (15) which prints two test marks on a printing medium according to a designated error distance.”

However, Ikeda sets forth “during main scanning in the forward direction executed by the recording head A, reference image (shown by reference ‘a-ref1’ in FIGS. 1 and 4) extending in the sub-scanning direction is formed at a predetermined position on the recording medium, for example, in this embodiment, near the left end of the recording medium. In addition, the same recording head A is used to form images a-F and a-R at predetermined positions on the recording medium 114 during main-scanning movements of the carriage in the forward and reverse directions.”

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Ikeda does not disclose or suggest at least “a test mark print-directing unit which prints two test marks on a printing medium according to a designated error distance” recited in claim 13.

As noted above, claims 14, 22, 23 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 1, as well as for the differing features recited therein.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-21 which depend from independent claim 14 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

The Examiner stated that claims 5, 11, 18 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form.

As noted above, as the respective independent claims are in allowable condition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 11, 18 and 19 are also allowable.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By:


Stephen T. Boughner
Registration No. 45,317

Date: 2/14/05
1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501